IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.K.BASHEER

MONDAY, THE 4TH JUNE 2007 / 14TH JYAISHTA 1929

WP(C).No. 16919 of 2007(L)

PETITIONER:

BEENA KUMARI.G., LPSA,
LMLP SCHOOL, MELPURANTHAMON,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.M.V.THAMBAN
SRI.V.K.SATHYANATHAN

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. ASSISTANT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER,
KILIMANNOOR.

2. THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER,
ATTINGAL.

3. THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

4. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY
ITS SECRETARY TO THE GOVT., DEPARTMENT OF
GENERAL EDUCATION, GOVT. SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

5. THE MANAGER,
CORPORATE MANAGEMENT OF LUTHERAN SCHOOLS,
INDIA EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM SYNOD, PERURKADA (PO),
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.A.J.VARGHESE

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 04/06/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

A.K.BASHEER, J.

W.P.(C)No.16919 OF 2007

Dated this the 4th day of June, 2007

JUDGMENT

Petitioner contends that she was originally appointed as an Upper Primary School Assistant in LMLP School at Nilamel under the management of respondent no.5 in a leave vacancy from January 5, 2000 to March 9, 2000. According to her, the said appointment was approved by the Assistant Educational Officer, Chadayamangalam. Petitioner further contends that she was again appointed in another leave vacancy in the year 2003. The said appointment was not approved. Petitioner has got a further case that she got another appointment in another leave vacancy in the year 2004 and yet again in 2005. The case of the petitioner appears to be that the statutory authorities are not justified in refusing to approve the appointments of the petitioner.

2. I do not propose to deal with any of the above contentions at this stage in view of the limited prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner at the Bar. He submits

that petitioner will be satisfied, if an appropriate direction is issued to respondent no.4 to consider and pass orders on Ext.P7 revision petition filed by the petitioner in which she is stated to have highlighted the relevant aspects of the issue. Learned Government Pleader submits that an appropriate decision on Ext.P7 will be taken without any delay.

3. In the above facts and circumstances, writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent no.4 to consider and pass orders on Ext.P7 strictly on its merit and in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment. Needless to mention that the petitioner and the manager of the School shall be afforded sufficient opportunity to be heard before any decision is taken on Ext.P7. Petitioner shall produce a copy of the writ petition and a certified copy of the judgment before respondent no.4 for compliance.

Writ petition is disposed of as above.

A.K.BASHEER, JUDGE

jes